

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (V.1)**

*DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE*

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
*August 5, 2002*  
*Richland, WA*

<b>Topics in this Meeting Summary</b>
---------------------------------------

Introduction.....	1
Review of Leadership Retreat.....	1
The Hanford Advisory Board's Priority Focus: Acceleration.....	2
Community Work Plan.....	3
Review Adopted Advice #134.....	4
Performance Metrics for ISMS.....	5
Committee Business.....	6
Handouts.....	6
Attendees.....	6

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>
---

### **Introduction**

The Chair of the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP) Committee, Keith Smith, welcomed everyone to the meeting and announced that Vice-chair Tim Takaro could not attend in person, but was able to participate via the conference phone. Attendees introduced themselves. The committee adopted the April meeting summary with no changes.

### **Review of Leadership Retreat**

Keith Smith announced items that the committee members at the leadership retreat decided needed to be done to prepare for the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting in September. Keith reminded the committee that it was to identify and prioritize what it wanted to concentrate on for the next year. A prioritized list would not mean that the committee is locked into doing only what was on the list, but it would provide a plan with which they could proceed. He noted that in many cases, since small subsets of the members are doing most of the work, he would evaluate individual assignments to spread the work out. Keith also called for better attendance to the committee meetings; he plans to call committee members prior to meetings to encourage attendance. He noted that another item from the leadership retreat was a decision to ask Department of Energy (DOE) to enforce the Board's policy of replacing board seats that go unrepresented for three months.

There had also been discussion at the retreat about the effect of the DOE Performance Management Plan (PMP) on the committee's focus. The committee should determine where it will direct its efforts, what the health, safety and environmental impacts are, and what the committee thinks DOE should do about it.

### **The Hanford Advisory Board's Priority Focus: Acceleration**

Todd Martin, HAB Chair, distributed a memo describing what the leadership committee felt were the top priorities facing the HAB and a tentative schedule for proceeding with those priorities. Acceleration was noted as the HAB's focus and would be the umbrella covering the listed items. Todd asked the committee to respond to the memo by answering the five key questions that the Board will use to evaluate acceleration proposals:

1. What is proposed for acceleration?
2. How will the acceleration be accomplished?
3. What are the environmental, health and safety impacts of acceleration proposal?
4. What are the impacts of the acceleration proposal on both the Hanford system and the DOE-wide system?
5. What are the public involvement impacts/needs associated with the acceleration proposal?

Based on the PMP, six acceleration issues were identified, as were the committees that would address the issue and an estimated HAB meeting focus date, which Todd reminded the group was not set in stone.

1. Tanks, *Tanks Committee*, November 2002.
2. Site-wide Integrated Groundwater Protection Program, *River and Plateau Committee*, December 2002.
3. Accelerated Waste Disposal, *River and Plateau Committee*, February 2003.
4. Accelerate Central Plateau Cleanup, *River and Plateau Committee*, June 2003.
5. Link Acceleration Plans and Baselines, *Budgets and Contracts Committee*, April 2003.
6. Long-term Stewardship Plan, *River and Plateau Committee*, December 2002.

### ***Committee Discussion/Questions***

- It might be difficult to accelerate the timeline for cleanup since many issues already feel rushed. Key question #2, "How will the acceleration be accomplished?" addresses that concern by forcing the HAB to evaluate issues on a case-by-case basis.
- The HSEP committee appears not to have any part of the acceleration discussion because it is not listed as a lead technical committee, even though it could address several of the key questions and risks; HSEP's concerns are technical too. *Todd replied the committees that are addressing the issues are technical, but that does not mean that the bulk of the work would belong to those committees. In the future, there could be joint committee meetings or other ways to incorporate interested people/committees. The lead committees are more of a focus of responsibility, rather than a set program of who will be doing predetermined work. The HSEP committee*

*would participate with the lead committee or take pieces and develop criteria for making acceleration acceptable and functional.*

- Acceleration could be a threatening word, agreeing to move ahead at a faster rate without currently having a plan of action...like the idea of not having a permanent vitrification plant.
- If, for example, the committees tackle tank issues in November, how would the HSEP committee work on health/safety/environmental issues?
- Some committee members felt that joint committee participation would overtax the committee's already full agenda, making it difficult to work with other committees. There may be occasions when overriding issues would affect and include all committees, but that would be rare. Some committee members felt that the HSEP committee should be autonomous. Others felt that many of the key questions pertained to the HSEP committee, so it ought to be involved. Each committee will have to deal with some or all of the issues presented in Todd's memo. All agreed, in the end, that the HSEP committee would take the health, safety, and environmental risks relevant to the HAB's discussions and offer its perspective on those risks. The committee would work autonomously, but in concert with the meeting focuses and package work around that focus.
- A committee member asked if it would be acceptable to attend other committee meetings as an observer to learn more or listen in on conference calls without participating in the discussion? *Yes.*

### **Committee Work Plan**

Penny asked the committee to examine each item on its Work Plan and determine which were still active priorities, or if some should be moved to a low priority "watch" list. The Work Plan is a way for the committees to see what tasks are remaining, which have been addressed and how well each committee is keeping on task. The committee completed the Work Plan.

### **Committee Discussion/Questions**

- Jim Trombold discussed his interest in the air and water monitoring item on the workplan. He plans to do research, and perhaps help the committee develop answers to the following questions. Regarding air and water monitoring, how do we, as citizens, know that the public is being protected from materials from Hanford? Is there documentation showing exactly what is done right now? Are things checked often enough? What types of monitoring strategies are used? What is being done about air and water? Jim will work with the material that was already presented to the committee on monitoring, and will work with Barb Wise to further frame the issue and do his research to present to the committee at a later date.
- Marjory Swint said she would join the Tanks Committee since she was only on one committee and was looking to participate in another.
- Tim Takaro asked if the HAB's advice letter on the Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement said malevolent acts must be considered? And if so, what was the response to that. *The advice did include that statement, and the Board has not yet received response to the advice.*

- What is the difference between exposure scenarios and risk assessment? *An exposure scenario describes what needs to be looked at regarding human and environmental health in the time frame in which that exposure is occurring. Agencies calculate human health and environmental risk and then determine what exposure levels are appropriate. Exposure scenarios consider risk.*
- Is the Exposure Scenario Task Force going to address risk assessments? *No, just exposure areas. The task force just describes what needs to be calculated, depending on how an area is cleaned.*
- A committee member was concerned that important infrastructure issues were being neglected in favor of the PMP issues. The infrastructure on the site, including roofs, water supply, pumps, electrical components, is very old and could break at any time. When will the site stop running it? If the site wants to accelerate, should it rely on the old infrastructure or put new money into it? Will the money get raided before the infrastructure can be replaced. *There are infrastructure-related issues mentioned in the PMP, and the committee should follow them.*

### ***Regulator Perspective***

- Michelle Anderson-Moore, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) reported that she did not have a comment on each issue in the work plan, but suggested that the beryllium issue should be added to the list. She said that she would find out the contact person within Ecology.

### **Review Adopted Advice #134 – ISMS**

Issue Manager Tim Takaro pointed out that there was a difference of opinion among Board members with regards to the allowance of future construction contractors to opt out of medical surveillance. Some committee members felt it was not the purview of the Board to involve itself on that particular issue.

### ***Committee Discussion/Questions***

- The committee discussed its role in providing advice to DOE on contracts. A committee member commented that the HAB should not micromanage DOE's contracts. DOE has been writing contracts for years and knows the rules and regulations protecting its workers. The contracts should not be generic, but should be tailored to the work done. If monitoring is not needed, it should not be required. DOE is responsible for the health and safety of its workers; second-guessing is not the HAB's responsibility. Another committee member felt that providing thoughts and concerns through advice is not micromanaging.
- Another committee member observed that if there was an instance where monitoring was not being done when it was needed, the committee ought to advise. Advising when it is not necessary dilutes its power when advice is truly needed.
- Does DOE treat every person in every position the same? Is everyone getting a dosimeter? *No, but every job is reevaluated every year to see if their exposure is the same.*
- Assessments should be for people onsite, rather than for people in an office in town; workers should receive examinations in relation to their particular job.

- Hanford workers have been bothered by the variety of programs and the substantial differences between contractors.
- The site needs a baseline for testing people. There are workers all over the site, so if there is no basis to test workers to know what made them sick, it will not be possible to be sure they are sick from working at Hanford.
- All workers onsite are protected under the Code of Federal Regulations-10; there are monitors.
- What is the difference between industrial use versus unrestricted use? *Industrial use is a shorter term of exposure, generally spending most of the workday indoors. Unrestricted would require a higher level of cleanup.*
- DOE should not automatically write contracts allowing people to opt out of a system that could be tailored to a particular risk and which was put in place to monitor safety concerns.
- Al Hawkins, DOE-ORP, announced that he had talked to Leif Erickson, DOE-ORP, regarding the Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) contract and whether omission of the Employee Job Task Analysis (EJTA) was deliberate. It was not an oversight. Leif would be willing to talk to the committee about the subject if requested to do so.

#### ***Regulator Perspective***

- Michelle Anderson-Moore, Ecology, had no official comments.
- No representatives from EPA were present.

#### **Performance Metrics for the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS)**

Issue Manager Tim Takaro discussed how to best analyze health and safety. The goal is to improve safety performance overall. Technology needs to be developed to go beyond traditional measurements. The metrics translate into the best ways of defining performance. Regarding the memo distributed by Todd Martin, the ISM components have not been explicitly defined but crosscut all six acceleration issues. The memo outlined tradeoffs and risks and how components other than productivity should be measured.

#### ***Committee Discussion/Questions***

- A committee member asked whether the PMP included information on metrics. *See page 72 of the PMP for a reflection of the Cleanup Challenges and Constraints (C3T) initiatives.*
- The committee decided to add a column to its Work Plan titled “metrics,” which will pertain to accelerated tank closure and tank construction.
- Dan Simpson provided a memo he had written on cleanup metrics outlining three measurements: public risk, ecological impact, and release of radiological pollution. These would show how much of Hanford is clean. It would document many events, including worker accident rates, unexpected events, regulatory interactions, and permits and authorizations granted and not granted. *Keith will forward Dan’s memo to Penny and she will distribute it to the committee.*

### **Committee Business**

- Penny Mabie will update the committee work plan to reflect changes made during the meeting. Penny and Barbara Wise will prepare a matrix for the committee to use for work assignments.
- The next committee check-in call is scheduled for August 21, 2002 at 2:00 pm. Tim Takaro will comment by sending an email to Penny.
- Jim Trombold will join Keith Smith as HSEP representative on the next Executive Issues Management Group call on August 22, 2002 at 3:00 pm.
- The committee will discuss future meeting topics during the committee call. Penny and Keith both expressed urgency in all members attending the call.

### **Handouts**

- Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee Agenda; August 5, 2002.
- The Hanford Advisory Board's Priority Focus: Acceleration (Todd Martin).

### **Attendees**

#### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Harold Heacock	Charles Kilbury	Todd Martin
Dan Simpson	Keith Smith	Marjory Swint
Tim Takaro (via phone)	Jim Trombold	

#### **Others**

Al Hawkins, DOE-ORP	Michelle Anderson-Moore, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
	Jean Vanni, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
		Colleen Owens, EIR
		Gerald Westerbeck, EIR
		Courtney Harris, EnviroIssues
		Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengston, PNNL